1888MNRAS..48..253A

MONTHLY NOTICES

OF THE

ROYAL ASTRONOMICAL SOCIETY.

VOL. XLVIII. MARCH 9, 1888. NO. 5

W. H. M. CHRISTIE, M.A., F.R.S., President, in the Chair.

Arthur Berry, B.A., King's College, Cambridge; and
The Rev. Walter Edward Stewart, M.A., 1 Banks Terrace, Croft-on-Tees, Darlington,

were balloted for and duly elected Fellows of the Society.

The following candidates were proposed as Fellows of the Society, the name of the proposer from personal knowledge being appended:—

Thomas Dallmeyer, 18 Bloomsbury Street, W.C. (proposed by Capt. W. de W. Abney);
George Wilson Heath, F.R.G.S., Scientific Instrument Manufacturer, Bexley, Kent (proposed by J. R. Jones);
Alfred Robert Johnson, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge (proposed by H. H. Turner);
Reginald Carter Nelson, Solicitor, 19 Roker Terrace, Sunderland (proposed by Cuthbert Hutchinson);
Sir Henry Thompson, M.B., 35 Wimpole Street, W. (proposed by A. A. Common);
John Walther, M.D., C.M. Edin., West House, Eastbourne (proposed by John Browning).

The Numerical Lunar Theory.

(Extract from a letter from Sir G. B. Airy to Mr. Knobel.)

In my Numerical Lunar Theory, Section VI., page 76, I remarked that there were difficulties in the lunar theory which I had not overcome; and which I naturally attributed to some error of my own mathematical work. I have now discovered the error.

Downloaded from http://mnras.oxfordjournals.org/ at North Dakota State University on July 9, 2015

© Royal Astronomical Society • Provided by the NASA Astrophysics Data System

1888MNRAS..48..253A

In page 11, I assumed the existence of a solar term, with a coefficient which I called M, and which I supposed to exercise an influence on the lunar motions. I was not justified in this assumption, and I withdraw it entirely.

It is necessary now to modify the text of some of the following sections, and to substitute in several places new piles of figures for those which I had furnished. The work will be considerable, and must be done, in a great measure, by myself. However, I have already taken some steps for effecting it. I can only report at present that page 11 is to be entirely expunged. But I hope this day to give instructions to computers.

The White House, Croom's Hill, Greenwich Park:
1888, *March* 23.

Orbit of the Binary Star λ Ophiuchi. By Professor S. Glasenapp.

(*Communicated by E. Dunkin, F.R.S.*)

The observations of this binary star, made by several observers during the last sixty-two years, show a direct motion for the component. This motion can be easily seen from the following measurements which we select from a long series of observations :—

Epoch.	θ	σ	Observer.
1825·51	331°·4	0″·8	W. Struve.
1828·64	341·3	0·8	J. Herschel, W. Struve.
1840·55	357·9	1·0	O. Struve, Bishop.
1853·52	13·3	1·3	O. Struve, Dawes, Smyth.
1861·61	20·9	1·3	O. Struve, Mädler.
1868·57	27·1	1·4	O. Struve, Dunér, Dembowski, Main.
1877·51	33·6	1·5	O. Struve, Dembowski, Jedrzejewicz, Doberck.
1886·58	42·0	1·5	A. Hall, Jedrzejewicz.

Now the observations of W. Herschel (*Phil. Trans.* 1804, Part II. p. 374) :—

1783·18	75°·5	±0″·50
1802·39	69°·3	—

indicate a retrograde motion of about 6° in 19 years; therefore it is evident that one of these observations or both of them are erroneous. Several astronomers have tried to restore these observations, and have supposed that the true measurements may be read as follows :—

Downloaded from http://mnras.oxfordjournals.org/ at North Dakota State University on July 9, 2015

© Royal Astronomical Society • Provided by the NASA Astrophysics Data System